

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/658,988	DAWS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Rudy Zervigon	1763	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Richard Stanley. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Christin; Fran.cedilla.ois et al. (US 5904957 A).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Stanley centered his discussion on the final three lines of claim 24 describing flow paths as shown in Applicant's Figure 1. Specifically, element 24 \*divides\* a flow path \*below\* base plate 46. The Examiner emphasized that Applicant's latest claim amendments remain anticipatory in view of the prior art and the Examiner's interpretation. Applicant is urged to claim the flow dividing element of 24 to remove the anticipation rejection. Because Christen's elements 25; Figure 2 are solid rings, the Examiner must consider rejections under 103 if the above suggestions are adopted.